

were to entertain those 45-plus notices over the next couple of days, that would take up probably 24 legislative hours of this body.

This body has been working diligently to try to complete the work of the House so that we can adjourn for this year. As everyone knows, there are three appropriation bills that are contentious. One of those deals with the Census issue which we are told now is about to be worked out. Another dealt with an abortion issue on the Foreign Operations appropriation bill. We are told that the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] has just about completed a compromise on that, and we are told that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GOODLING], in negotiations with the House, has just about completed a compromise on the testing.

So that the only issues really to come before this body between now and the time that we would adjourn would be those three appropriation bills, the fast track bill, whether my colleagues are for or against it, I happen to be opposed to it, and some other measures such as these nine United States-China relation bills that are terribly important on the floor, now that it is going to take about 14 or 15 hours.

My point is, we have been delayed now so that we will not be able to complete the day's work on these China bills even if we stay until midnight, which we are, incidentally. We are going to stay at least until midnight. But even then, we will have to carry over five or six of these China bills until tomorrow, and then that just delays any chance that we might have had, I think, of adjourning for the year this Saturday, and even perhaps this Sunday.

But that part is irrelevant. The part that concerns me is that in all of the notices that have been brought before the House, I believe, and I say this sincerely, with no animosity, and I will not yield until I am finished, but I will be glad to at some point, I just believe, I sincerely believe, that they are deleterious in nature, and I have discussed this with the Speaker of the House and asked him if he would not declare them deleterious, keeping in mind that if one or two wanted to be offered each day, certainly knowing the sincerity by some Members of the other side of the aisle that we ought to, as my colleagues know, go along with that. But the Speaker is hesitant to do that because he wants to keep comity in the House.

But, nevertheless, it is the responsibility of the Committee on Rules to see to it that we complete our work on this session, and that is why I have scheduled a Committee on Rules meeting, and I would make notice to the members of the Committee on Rules that we will be considering in the Committee on Rules a two-thirds waiver for remaining appropriation bills from now until Sunday, which means that if the appropriation bills were complete, we could bring them up in the same day.

This is, and when I finish I will yield, this is typical of nomenclature that we do each year. We would also include in that rule permission for suspension days to be brought up with notice to the minority any day between now and Sunday so that we could take care of those significant issues that were not controversial and perhaps deal with them between now and Sunday.

But, also, I am just going to reluctantly recommend to the leadership that we limit in some way the notices that Members can bring on questions of privilege. Perhaps, and I have not decided how we will do this, but perhaps giving that right to the minority leader and the majority leader so that we can have negotiations that try to work out some comity and complete the work of the House. It is terribly important for the American people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from San Diego, CA [Mr. HUNTER].

Mr. HUNTER. Mr. Speaker, let me just say that I support what he is trying to do for the simple reason that I have heard the notices read over and over again protesting the fact that we do not have a result yet in the election contest, and I just say to my friends that the notices are written in such a way that they are totally one-sided, there is no time for debate, and I sit there looking at the newspaper headlines in California saying that the secretary of state has found that 60 percent of the registrations by one group of people who were registered and voted manipulated—it says that 60 percent of these registrations were illegal.

And yet the idea, if my colleagues listen to the text of the privileged resolutions, which, in essence, are arguments themselves, they talk about Marine barracks being questioned and nuns being questioned. And of course those may be in the huge universe of tens of thousands of people, but the fact that one group alone was found to have had 60 percent of their registrations being fraudulent, and the idea that this House should not investigate that, and that there is no chance for a debate on these privileged motions, they are simply read over and over again in rote.

□ 1600

They were obviously written in such a way as to make the argument in the resolution itself.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HUNTER. I am not going to yield until I am able to finish my sentence.

That, I think, offers no value to this deliberative body, because there is absolutely no time given on the other side, and it gives the impression to the people out in the countryside that there is not a group that had 60 percent fraudulent registrations, which in fact has been the finding of the secretary of state, which would justify any deliberative body in the world at least the idea that we should go forward and at least have a further investigation until we find all the information.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, first of all, I have to yield to the gentleman from Texas who asked me to yield in the first place, and then, if the gentlewoman would let him speak for her, because we have to get on with the regular order.

Ms. DELAURO. Well, I would like to correct the RECORD in a couple of ways, if I can.

Mr. SOLOMON. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will first yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Would the gentleman from Texas rather I yield to the gentlewoman from Connecticut?

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, that is fine.

Mr. SOLOMON. I just did not want to slight the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. There are two points here. One has to do with our colleague, the gentlewoman from California [Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD] who, in fact, has introduced two privileged motions, two different dates. Both are different, if the gentleman will check and take a look at the Record.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, would the gentlewoman explain to us how they are different?

Ms. DELAURO. Let me just finish.

Second, there is nothing, nothing, nothing we would like better on this side of the aisle on this issue than to have the opportunity for debate. Every time one of these, after the notice and the vote comes due, we would love to have a debate. In fact, what happens is that a Member gets up and calls for the motion to be tabled, so in fact, we cannot have a debate.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, we have already had that debate.

Ms. DELAURO. Allow us the opportunity to have the debate on this.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, regular order. Reclaiming my time, the Gephardt debate amendment, or questions of privileges, has been debated on the floor. I now yield back.

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO SPEAK OUT OF ORDER

Mr. HEFNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be recognized out of order for 5 minutes.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, we have to continue with regular order.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York spoke out of order for 5 minutes, or longer than that.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CALVERT). Objection is heard.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF NINE MEASURES RELATING TO THE POLICY OF THE UNITED STATES WITH RESPECT TO THE PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I